IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY FOURTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE DR JUSTICE G.YETHIRAJULU

WRIT PETITION NO.17225 of 2004

Between:

Smt. Gatty lalitha Kumari, D/o G.V.A. Ramakrishnaiah (late)
R/o MPUP School, Nunaparti, Atchuthapuram Mandal, Visakhapatnam District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 Board of Secondary School Education, Nampally, Hyderabad,
Rep. by its Secretary.
2 The District Educational Officer, Visakhapatnam, Visakhapatnam

District.
3 The District Educational Officer, Krishna District at Machilipatnam.
4 The Mandal Education Officer, Atchutapuram Mandal,

Visakhapatnam District.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a Writ, order or Direction more especially one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to correct the petitioner's date of birth as 9-10-1946 to 9-10-1948 on the SSLC Certificate bearing Sl.No. 3683 and also in her service records.

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.P.SRI RAGHU RAM, Advocate
Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR EDUCATION

The Court, at the stage of admission, made the following :

....

O R D E R:

The petitioner is working as Headmistress. She is at fag end of the service. Now the petitioner realized that her date of birth has been wrongly mentioned in the school records and in the service records. She alleged to have made a representation on 17-8-2004 to the 4th respondent and the same was not considered by the 4th respondent giving a reply dated 18-8-2004. Subsequently, the petitioner made a representation to the first respondent on 20-08-2004. But no orders have been passed by the first respondent. The petitioner is seeking correction of the date of birth from 9-10-1946 as 9-10-1948. The legal position on this subject is very clear. The request of an employee for correction of date of birth at the fag end of the service cannot be considered. The petitioner cannot maintain the writ petition. The first respondent is at liberty to pass appropriate orders on the representation of the petitioner dated 20-8-2004.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

_____

24th September, 2004.

Mrb

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

// TRUE COPY //

SECTION OFFICER

To

1 The Secretary,

Board of Secondary School Education, Nampally, Hyderabad,
2 The District Educational Officer, Visakhapatnam, Visakhapatnam

District.
3 The District Educational Officer, Krishna District at Machilipatnam.
4 The Mandal Education Officer, Atchutapuram Mandal,

Visakhapatnam District.

5. Two CD to G.P. for School Education, High Court Buildings,

Hyderabad (OUT)

6. Two CD copies